DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 664 FL 008 666

AUTHOR Bruck, Margaret; Shultz, Jeffrey
TITLE An Ethnographic Analysis of the Language Use Patterns of Bilingually Schooled Children. Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 13.
INSTITUTION Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto. Bilingual Education Project.
PUB DATE May 77
NOTE 38p.; For related documents, see FL 008 663-669
AVAILABLE FROM Bilingual Education Project, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1V6 (as long as supply lasts)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; Bilingual Students; Bilingual Teachers; English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; Grade 1; Interaction; *Language Usage; *Peer Relationship; Primary Education; Sociolinguistics; Spanish; Spanish Speaking; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Influence; Video Tape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS *Code Switching (Language); Ethnography; Language Dominance

ABSTRACT

Language use patterns of two grade one children in a Spanish-English half-day pull-out transitional bilingual program were examined. Videotape data were collected three times throughout the school year in both the bilingual and regular English classrooms. Over the year there were two teachers in the bilingual class: one English dominant, the second Spanish dominant. Analyses focused on the amount of language used in different settings and the conditions under which each language was used for teacher-child and child-child interactions. The data were analyzed to examine the effects that time and teacher language dominance had on these patterns. Results of the study indicate that the use of English increases throughout the year, and that teacher's language dominance has a pervasive effect on language use patterns. The contribution of this study to bilingual education, sociolinguistics and evaluation methodology is discussed. (Author/CFM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140664

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Ethnographic Analysis of the Language Use Patterns of Bilingually Schooled Children

Margaret Bruck
McGill University

Jeffrey Shultz
University of Cincinnati

Abstract

Language use patterns of two Grade one children in a Spanish-English half-day pull out transitional bilingual program were examined. Videotape data were collected three times throughout the school year in both the bilingual and regular English classrooms. Over the year there were two different teachers in the bilingual class: one English dominant, the second Spanish dominant. Analyses focused on the amount of language used in different settings and the conditions under which each language was used for teacher-child and child-child interactions. The data were analyzed to examine the effects that time and teacher language dominance had on these patterns. Results of the study indicate that the use of English increases throughout the year, and that teacher's language dominance has a pervasive effect on language use patterns. The contribution of this study to bilingual education, sociolinguistics and evaluation methodology is discussed.

FL 008666

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Working Papers on Bilingualism
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

An Ethnographic Analysis of the Language Use Patterns of Bilingually Schooled Children

Margaret Bruck [1] Jeffrey Shultz

In the past decade there have been a number of evaluations of bilingual education programs (e.g. Barik and Swain, 1975; Bruck, Lambert, and Tucker, 1974; Cohen, 1975; Dillon, 1971; Goodman and Stern, 1971). While this number continues to grow most of the evaluations are product (outcome) rather than process (dynamically) oriented. Thus although there is a fair amount of information documenting the effects of bilingual education programs on the academic, social, linguistic and cognitive development of its students, little information is available on the dynamics of the situations in which the concerned students are involved.

Process data are crucial for the interpretation of product data. Product data yield information on how well a specific group do on a specific test which purports to measure some skill or ability. Process data yield information on why the group performs the way they do on that test: process evaluation is concerned with the description of events in the classroom which are the educational causes of the effects measured by product evaluations. Ideally the two types of evaluations would be carried out in conjunction with each other; first however a method for undertaking process evaluations must be developed. The purpose of this pilot study is to examine the educational environment of the bilingually schooled child by means of techniques derived from the work of ethnographers of speaking. (c.f. Erikson and Shultz, 1976, Hymes, 1976). Specifically the patterns of language used in the environment of two Grade 1 bilingually schooled children (Spanish/English) were analyzed from videotape data three times during the school year to systematically describe the process or nature of events that occur in a bilingual classroom.

This study was primarily undertaken for very applied concerns. It was a component of a large scale evaluation of the Bilingual Programs in Downstate Illinois. This component represented an attempt to study some of the processes of bilingual education using techniques that others have used to study social interaction in Anglo classrooms (c.f. Mehan et al, 1976; McDermott, 1976; Shultz, 1976).

Results of the present study are of relevance for pedagogical, theoretical and methodological reasons. Pedagogically, there appear to be few process evaluations which are educationally relevant. In a review of Title VII evaluations, a few process evaluations were found which used a variety of methods to describe the dynamics of a specific program or classroom. For example, teachers were given checklists and asked to indicate the percentage of time devoted to different activities (Cox, 1975). In another program, teachers were administered the Flanders Interaction Analysis Scale three times during the year to determine the amount of teacher talk-time (Corpus Christi, 1975). In other programs individual students or classrooms were observed for selected periods during the school year to determine the amount of language used for different activities and situations (Chula Vista, 1973; Beacon, 1973; Austin, 1975; Cohen for Redwood City, 1975). In one evaluation (Beacon, 1973) the evaluator, based on classroom observations, rated 19 instructional processes related to

bilingual education on a five point scale (e.g. students responded to teacher in the same language addressed; teacher indicated the attitude the school cares to the student). The greatest shortcoming of many of these evaluations is the lack of generalizable statements about the processes of a bilingual educational program. In order for these process evaluations to be of significance for the practitioner, some general conclusions about what is going on in the bilingual classroom must be drawn. Educators need to know: How bilingual is a bilingual classroom? Are the models that are proposed for specific programs (e.g. alternate days, concurrent, half-day pull out) actually being followed in the classroom by the teacher and pupils? Detailed information is required concerning the extent to which each language is used as well as the conditions under which each language is used by the participants. In the present study some of these issues are addressed on an exploratory basis.

Theoretically, the results of this investigation will provide some data relevant to the study of the ethnography of speaking. This is the study of what a participant must know to act appropriately in a given culture (Goodenough, 1964). It is a sociolinguistic fact that every speaker controls a number of varieties of speech patterns. The choice of a specific pattern is not random but is determined by a number of contextual constraints: where the speakers are, who is present, the topic, the relative status of the speakers, etc. The purpose of an ethnography of speaking is to explain these patterns of language use in terms of the sociocultural meanings associated with each variety. Thus an ethnography of speaking not only yields information on when and how different speech varieties are used, but also makes inferences about the social and cultural meanings which are involved in selecting one form as opposed to another (c.f. Blom and Gumperz, 1972).

This kind of study relies on naturalistically collected data. In order to understand the patterns of language use in a specific community, detailed data on the contexts in which the language is used must be known (i.e. the topic of conversation, the relative status of the speakers, where the interaction occurs, etc.). This can only be done if language samples are collected of actual social interaction.

There have been several studies of social interaction in bilingual classrooms. Genishi (1976), Legarreta (1975), Phillips (1975), and Shultz (1975) each examined the amount of Spanish and English used in bilingual classrooms as well as the conditions under which both languages were used. Genishi found that although Spanish was used more often than English in structured classroom situations, the children chose to use English more frequently in unstructured situations. Phillips, Legarreta, and Shultz all found a predominant use of English in the classrooms*.

---

* Legarreta studied five concurrent-approach classrooms and one alternate days classroom. In the latter case she found equal use of the two languages. However it is difficult to determine whether this difference was due to the program or to the individual teacher.

It appears that English is used for discipline and control while Spanish is used primarily for instruction. Results of these studies strongly suggest that English is the dominant language in the classroom and that the child's vernacular is of relative unimportance in the educational setting.

While all the above studies were carried out in bilingual classrooms, the researchers were primarily intersted in the phenomenon of language use rather than the processes of bilingual education per se. Thus the data analysis as well as the types of conclusions drawn are not as pertinent to practitioners as they might be. In the present study an attempt is made to address both theoretical and practical issues related to patterns of language use in a bilingual classroom.

Methodologically, this study makes two contributions. First, to our knowledge, it is the first bilingual classroom study to use videotape equipment. All previous studies have either used questionnaires, on-site coding procedures, or audio tape procedures. Questionnaires and self-reports are highly unreliable especially in the study of language use patterns (Blom and Gumperz, 1972). On-site coding is also unreliable: the researcher has no recourse to his observations and must make on the spot decisions which are often highly subjective (e.g. uses language A to express warmth) or difficult to code for the first time (e.g. it is often difficult to determine which language is being used at a particular time especially if mixing of languages occurs). While the use of audio tape solves some of these problems, one still loses much detailed information on the non-verbal contexts of the interactions which are crucial for their understanding. The use of video equipment solves the above problems: on site judgements need not be made; and one has a visual record of the contexts of the interactions that can be played back to check on the reliability of rater's judgements.

The second methodological contribution involves the attempt to use video and ethnographic methods for program evaluation. While we believe these methods to be extremely suitable for the study of classroom dynamics, it may be that these techniques are too expensive in terms of time and equipment, too sophisticated for the untrained researcher, and too limiting in terms of the number of situations and events that can be studied for the evaluator. In this study we deliberately tried to address these questions and problems by training research assistants to do the data collections and preliminary data analysis. Careful records were kept of the amount of time invested in the project as well as the numbers and types of problems that occurred.

Thus the purposes of the present pilot study were twofold: to better understand the process of education of the bilingually schooled child and to investigate the feasibility of using videotape and ethnographic procedures to examine this process in an evaluation context.

Specifically ethnographic procedures were used to obtain the following information:

I. How much each language (Spanish/English) is used:

a) during teacher-child interactions in the bilingual classroom;

b) during child-child interactions in the bilingual classroom;

c) during child-child interactions in a non-bilingual classroom setting

II. Is there a difference in the amount of Spanish used during peer-peer interaction in the bilingual classroom and in the non-bilingual classroom setting?

III. Does the relative amount of language used in a specific context change

a) as a function of time (over the school year);

b) as a function of teacher's language proficiency.

IV. For what purposes and under what conditions is each language used:

a) during teacher-child interactions in the bilingual classroom;

b) during child-child interactions in the bilingual classroom;

c) during child-child interactions in a non-bilingual classroom setting;

Information required to answer this question involves addressing the question of why code switching (i.e. a change of language during a conversation) occurs.

V. Do the rules for language use in specific settings change

a) as a function of time (over the school year)

b) as a function of teacher's language proficiency.

Method

School Setting

This paper examines the language interaction patterns of two grade 1 students and their bilingual teachers. The students attended a bilingual classroom for half a day and a regular English classroom for half a day. The bilingual and all-English schools were situated in a suburb 40 miles west of Chicago. The bilingual program was characterized as transitional-

half day pull-out. That is, children were bused from neighboring schools to attend the program either in the morning or afternoon (half day pull-out). They were selected by their "home" school to attend the program as their knowledge of English was insufficient to cope with the demands of the English classroom. Once their English language proficiency became adequate to meet these demands, participation in the bilingual program would be terminated (transitional).

Subject Selection

Two* children were selected to serve as target subjects. Both attended the same bilingual classroom. One attended in the morning (Maria), one attended in the afternoon (Rosa). The children, both female, attended two different English schools. In each of their regular classes there were children of similar linguistic backgrounds as well as native English speaking children. The children were selected because they satisfied the following criteria: 1) the English-school teacher approved of the project and allowed videotaping in the classroom; 2) parental permission was given; 3) the students were the correct age for their grade placement; and 4) they were characterized by the bilingual teacher as being Spanish dominant.

Home Background of Subjects.

The following information was obtained from the parents of the children by means of a home interview conducted in Spanish. The interview occurred at the end of the school year (Spring, 1976).

Maria's family had come from Mexico to the United States three years prior to the study. They moved into a Spanish-speaking neighborhood. Her father worked in a factory. Both parents spoke and read Spanish but reported little or no facility with English. Maria had two siblings, one of whom was also in the bilingual program. The mother said that the children used English when speaking to each other.

Rosa's family moved from Puerto Rico to the United States seven years prior to the study. She lived in an English-speaking neighborhood. There was no father present in the household. The mother spoke no English. There were four children, two of whom attended the bilingual program. The mother reported that the children spoke both Spanish and English among themselves.

Subject's Teachers.

Bilingual. There were two bilingual teachers and one student teacher. The first one (teacher A) taught the morning and afternoon classes for all but the last seven weeks of the school year and because of

---

* Originally three target subjects were selected for study. However soon after the project began one returned with his family to Mexico. Although he returned by the end of the school year, the child was eliminated as a subject.

sickness was replaced by Teacher B. Teacher A was a native Anglo who had a "good" command of Spanish. She had been teaching in a bilingual program for 3 years.

Teacher B, on the other hand, was Spanish dominant. She spoke English well, but with a marked accent. This was her first experience in a bilingual program, although she had been teaching for six years. Both teachers were assisted by the same student teacher who was of Mexican background.

English. The two English teachers instructed their classes entirely in English. Maria's teacher stated that she encouraged the use of English in the classroom. She reported that the children only spoke English. Rosa's teacher on the other hand said that she encouraged the use of two languages in the classroom, and that she felt that both in and out of the classroom the Spanish dominant children spoke Spanish among themselves.

Bilingual Classroom Curriculum.

The morning session met for 2.5 hours, and the afternoon session met for 2 hours. The sessions were divided into periods of Spanish reading readiness, arithmetic, English language arts, Spanish Culture and individual activity.

Both of the bilingual teachers stated that in all lessons, except English, only Spanish was used.

English Class Curriculum.

The two English teachers reported that their classroom activities were also fairly structured. Language arts and reading groups were the focus of the morning activities with math, social studies, and other subjects taught in the afternoon.

Data Collection

Videotaped data were collected three times during the 1975-76 school year: in November 1975, February 1976, and May 1976. For each data collection period, each of the two target subjects were taped for an entire school day (half a day in the bilingual class and half a day in the English class).

In each taping session the target child wore a wireless microphone. Two video cameras were used: a stationary and a portable camera. The stationary camera (Sony AVC 3250) and a microphone were focused on the entire classroom. Its purpose was to capture the child's placement and activities in the context of the whole class. A portable camera (Panasonic NV 3082) focused directly on the target child and her immediate social surroundings. This camera recorded the target child's conversation through the wireless microphone.

Bilingual teacher A was present for the first two tapings. Bilingual teacher B was present for the third taping.

After the first taping session, all the teachers were interviewed to obtain the following information: teacher's language background; teacher's attitude toward bilingual education; and teacher's description of language use patterns in the classroom.

Table 1 presents the "approximate" amount of tape time we obtained for each lession in the bilingual classroom for each time period. The English classroom times are also presented. While we attempted to videotape complete lessons, time was lost changing tapes, and fixing equipment. Also, as can be seen for taping period III, only half of Rosa's bilingual day and half of Maria's English day were recorded. Otherwise, there was a good sampling of lessons, most of which were complete. Recess was only taped for Maria's bilingual taping period III, in the other individual activity times, children were working together on the same task.

Table 1

Situations taped: Approximate Number of Minutes

	Bilingual a.m.						Regular p.m.
Maria	Math	Recess and Individual	English	Spanish	Culture	Total	All Subjects
Nov.	30	10	25	15	11	91	90
Feb.	20	None	20	40	10	90	75
May	15	15	30	35	05	100	45
	Bilingual p.m.						Regular a.m.
Rosa	Math	Individual	English	Spanish	Culture	Total	All Subjects
Nov	10	10	15	15	15	65	120
Feb.	25	10	10	25	10	80	120
May	not taped	not taped	25	30	not taped	50	105

Data Analysis

A coding system was developed to analyze the video data. The final version satisfied three criteria:

a) it could easily be taught to a naive coder;

b) it required as little inference on the part of the coder as possible;

c) it required a minimal amount of tape indexing and transcription.

In the bilingual classroom every interaction in the language environment of the target children was coded. In the English classroom, only interactions between the target child and her peers were coded. An interaction is defined as a series of conversational turns by two or more speakers around a common activity or topic which is temporally linked. Language environment refers to the language that occurs during an activity in which the target child is participating or is present. Thus in a lesson where the target child is participating all interactions would be coded - this includes interactions between the teacher and another child. However, if the target child was participating in one activity and the microphone picked up a conversation between a teacher and child involved in another activity, this would not be coded.

Each interaction was coded in the following way:

a) initiator
b) addressee
c) number of seconds of talk in Spanish
d) number of seconds of talk in English
e) context of the interaction (a statement about the lesson, the group, the topic)
f) gloss of the interaction (a brief description of the interaction)

Every time code-switching occurred this was noted, and the entire interaction was transcribed.

A detailed description of this coding system was written, along with the codings for two 30-minute tapes. The system was then taught to a research assistant who coded the tapes for all three data collection periods. A second assistant transcribed all the instances of code switching.

The codings were checked by the investigators who then used this system as a means of answering the research questions posed above.

Results

Originally, the study was designed to compare language use patterns of bilingually schooled children across three time periods to determine whether and in what ways these might change in the course of a school year. However, because the bilingual teacher who was present for taping periods I and II was replaced by second teacher for taping period III, the above comparison was not possible. Differences that might have occurred between the last taping period and previous ones, might have been due to teacher rather than to time differences. Specifically, teacher differences might have been attributable to differences in the teachers language abilities: Teacher A was English dominant, while teacher B was Spanish dominant. Thus what originally appeared to be a disaster for our design (i.e. a teacher change) became an added benefit in that a new and important dimension was added to the study: teacher language ability. Therefore, two types of comparisons were made:

a) a time comparison (time I vs. time II) and

b) a teacher language dominance comparison (time I and time II. vs. time III).

Quantitative as well as qualitative analyses were performed on the data. The quantitative analyses were performed to answer the "How much of each language was used" questions (see I, II, III p. 4) and the qualitative analyses were performed to answer the "Under which conditions was each language used" questions (see IV, V p. 4).

Quantitative Analysis

1. The amount of Spanish and English used in the bilingual classroom during teacher-child interactions.

Table 2 contains the percentage of time Spanish was used in the language environments of both students in the bilingual classroom. In terms of total amount of time (last column) devoted to Spanish, there was a sizeable decrease in the percent of time Spanish was used in the language environment of Rosa, while there was no change in amount of Spanish used for teacher-child interactions for Maria. It is unclear why there was a change in the teacher-child interactions from Time I to Time II for Rosa's class only. One possibility is sampling error. As can be seen from Table 2, for taping period 1, the amount of Spanish used by the teacher with Rosa's class (71%) is highly discrepant with the amount she used with Maria's class (41%). The latter figure, however, is very consistent with the amount of Spanish used in Time II for both Maria's class (41%) and Rosa's class (46%). Thus it is possible that for some reason, the teacher just used more Spanish for that one particular taping period, which was not reflective of her normal patterns; and therefore the change noted from Time I to Time II in Rosa's class could be due to sampling error, rather than to natural time factors.

TABLE 2

Percent of Time Spanish was used for Teacher-Child Interactions in the Bilingual Classroom

Maria's Class	Math	Individual	English	Spanish	Culture	Total**
Time 1 Teacher A	55	28	1	100	67	41
Time 2 Teacher A	55	none on taping day	3	92	7	41
Time 3 Teacher B	95	none on taping day*	29	97	99	71
Rosa's Class						
Time 1 Teacher A	67	64	0	97	96	71
Time 2 Teacher A	45	29	9	69	0	46
Time 3	not taped	not taped	0	60	not taped	

* Recess taped in this period was not analyzed because of poor audio.

** These totals are calculated by dividing the total time of Spanish by the total English and Spanish times.

By Time II, more time was being spent in English than Spanish. It should be noted that by February the entire culture lesson was taught in English even though it was designated by the teacher as a Spanish subject. More English also occurred in the Spanish Language Art Lessons, and Math lessons during Time II than in Time I.

There are differences between the amount of Spanish used in Teacher A's classroom and Teacher B's classroom, where the effect is most observable for Maria's class.* Teacher B clearly restored a Spanish balance to the classroom in Math, Spanish, and Culture, where most of her interactions with the students were in Spanish. Even during English Language Arts, she used more Spanish than Teacher A.

2. The amount of Spanish used during peer-peer interactions in the bilingual classroom. (See Table 3).

In Teacher A's classroom less Spanish was used by Maria for peer interactions during Time II (35%) than Time I (93%) while there was not much change in the total amount used by Rosa.**

This decrease in Spanish for Maria might be caused by a number of factors. One possibility is that the children were becoming more proficient in English and thus used it more than Spanish in Time II. A second possibility is that at Time I the children were not attuned to the rules of the language use in the bilingual classroom which involved using more English than Spanish. By Time II, their language use was consistent with these norms.

When Teacher B took over the classroom, there was an increase in the amount of Spanish used by the children among themselves. This increase in the use of Spanish at Time III over Time II was still not sufficient to reach the level of Spanish used by the children during Time I.

3. A comparison between language use by the children in the bilingual classroom with language use by the children in the regular classroom.

Table 4 presents the percentage of time that the target children were engaged in peer interactions in Spanish in the regular and bilingual classrooms. Both children tended to use Spanish more in the bilingual classroom. (N.B. Rosa uses equal proportions during Time II). By the end of the year, both children used relatively little Spanish in the regular classroom. In the bilingual classrooms, there was also a decrease in the amount of Spanish used from Time I to Time III by Maria.

---

* The data are too sparse to analyze for Rosa's class.

** This slight increase may not be real in that peer-peer interaction was not measured for the same activities for Time I and Time II.

TABLE 3

Percent of Time Spanish is used during Peer-Peer Interactions in the Bilingual Classroom

Maria's Class	Math	Individual	English	Spanish	Culture	Total
Time 1 Teacher A	100	25	no interactions	100	no interactions	93
Time 2 Teacher A	0	no activity on taping day	89	25	100	35
Time 3 Teacher B	13	not analyzed	70	35	96	50
Rosa's Class						
Time 1 Teacher A	no interactions	56	no interactions	no interactions	no interactions	56
Time 2 Teacher A	0	72	0	55	no interactions	67
Time 3 Teacher B	not taped	not taped	33	90	not taped	

TABLE 4

Percentage of Spanish used for Peer-Peer Interactions in the Bilingual and Regular Classrooms

Maria	Regular	Bilingual
Time 1	44	93
Time 2	1	35
Time 3	9	50
Rosa		
Time 1	23	56
Time 2	66	67
Time 3	11	*

* It is misleading to give a total here as the data are based on only two activities, while the other taping periods are based on five activities. See Table 3 for breakdowns.

Thus Spanish was being used less, and English was being used more as the primary language of communication between peers in both the Spanish and English classrooms.

To summarize, language ability of the teacher is an important factor in the quantitative analysis of language use patterns in the bilingual classroom. In this study, when the English-dominant teacher was present, the language of the classroom was predominantly English, while the opposite was true for the Spanish dominant teacher. The teacher's language ability also seems to affect the amount of Spanish used among the children in the bilingual although not the regular classroom.

Some of the data also suggest that time is an important factor in terms of amount of Spanish being used. Less Spanish was used for teacher-child interactions during taping period II in Rosa's classroom. Particularly interesting is the almost non-use of Spanish during the time II culture lessons in both classrooms. Generally less Spanish was used during peer-peer interactions in both the English and bilingual classrooms during Time II than in Time I.

Qualitative Analysis

While the above data reveal in gross terms how much each language is used in the classroom, they do not show how the languages were used nor the relative importance of the two languages for the participants in the classrooms. A qualitative analysis was thus performed on the data to determine for what purposes and under what conditions each language was used in the classroom. As stated above this analysis involved the analysis of when and why code switching occurs.

Again, time and teacher comparisons were made. First the teacher-child interactions will be presented. This will be followed by a discussion of the child-child interactions.

1. Teacher-child Interactions in the Bilingual Classroom.

The qualitative analysis of teacher-child interactions was carried out along three dimensions: activity, person, and purpose of the message.

Activity. In this section, we will examine how the two languages were used during and between different activities.

During period I Teacher A used predominantly Spanish during Spanish Language Arts, Math and Culture lessons only (see Table 2.) English was used during English Language Arts.

During taping period I, English was also used by Teacher A, at the very beginnings and ends of lessons. (These times between lessons will be called transitions.) This was true even if the lesson itself was conducted in Spanish. For example, the last utterance of a math lesson was

"Sit down and turn your papers over." The preceding and proceding utterances were all in Spanish. Of the 13 transitions that were taped for period I, 8 were in English, 3 were in Spanish and 2 were mixed (i.e. the two languages were used). The three Spanish utterances were made by the student teacher (who is Spanish dominant), while all 8 English utterances were made by the bilingual teacher. Thus during taping period I, the bilingual teacher was using English to mark junctures between segments of the school day. The use of English in these situations takes on the added meaning of a "contextualization cue" (c.f. Gumperz, 1976), and serves the function of informing the participants that something new is about to happen. Implicitly, the message seems to be: if you hear English, pay attention as something important is about to happen, and the activity is about to change.

In taping period II, the picture was not so clear, as English was used not only in English Language Arts, but it was also used for Culture. Spanish predominated again for Spanish Language Arts. The situation with language use during transitions was also not so clear-cut as it was for the first taping. Of the seven transitions taped, four were in Spanish, two were in English and one was mixed. It seems clear that language use patterns changed in the classroom. It may be that the teacher was no longer using English to mark junctures. This unclear pattern may also be a result of poor sampling procedures. That is, not enough transitions were taped from this period to arrive at any definite conclusions.

There were differences in the way teacher B used language during and between activities from the way teacher A used language. Teacher B used mainly Spanish for all lessons except for math and of course for English. Also, teacher B did not use English to mark the transition from one activity to the next. Rather, the language used during transitions was usually the language of the preceding lesson, which in most cases was Spanish.

In summary, depending upon the taping period, and the teacher, specific languages were used for specific lessons. In addition, during taping period I, English was the language most often used during transition periods. But, while activity is a useful dimension that accounted for some of the teacher-child language use patterns, it does not account for all of the variation. Other variables, namely person and purpose, were examined, in an attempt to explain the language use patterns of this classroom.

Person. Language use in the bilingual classroom can be partially explained by consideration of the person with whom the teacher was interacting. Our analysis focused on the teacher's interaction with the student teacher, the 2 target subjects, and other children in the class.

Teacher A only used English when speaking with the student-teacher and vice-versa. However, teacher B used Spanish with the student-teacher.

TABLE 5

Percentage of interactions in each language initiated by Teacher A and Target Children

Maria	MATH			ENGLISH			SPANISH			CULTURE			TOTAL		
Nov.	Eng	Sp	Cs*	Eng	Sp	Cs	Eng	Sp	Cs	Eng	Sp	Cs	Eng	Sp	Cs
Teacher initiates with Maria	25	50	25	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	29	57	14
Maria initiates with Teacher	0	0	0	75	0	25	0	100	0	0	100	0	50	33	17
Feb.															
Teacher initiates	50	0	50	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	71	0	29
Maria initiates	100	0	0	67	0	33	0	0	0	100	0	0	83	0	17
Rosa															
Nov.															
Teacher Initiates with Rosa	33	67	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	18	82	0
Rosa Initiates with Teacher	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	53	47	0
Feb.															
Teacher Initiates	100	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	50	100	0	0	86	0	14
Rosa Initiates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	67	0	0	0	0	33	67

*Cs = Code-switching interactions.

Thus once again the status and function that each language plays in the classroom is dependent on the teacher's language dominance.

Next the interactions between the teacher and each of the target subjects were analyzed. Table 5 summarizes these data for teacher A. In the case of Maria, there is a notable change in the language used from Time I to Time II. During Time I, most of the teacher's initiated interactions with Maria were in Spanish (except during English, when only English was used); however, by Time II, all interactions initiated by the teacher were in English. This change is also consistent with the change in Maria's initiations with the teacher. During Time I, all initiations (except during English period) were in Spanish; by Time II, all initiations were in English.

During Time I, all of Rosa's interactions with the teacher were in English (except during Spanish). However, the teacher used mostly Spanish with her. It is puzzling that Rosa used so much English and yet was classified as Spanish dominant by the teacher. It could be that by switching to English, Rosa was more likely to get the teacher's attention and gain the floor without being sanctioned. By Time II, all of the teacher's interactions with Rosa were in English. As there are only examples of Rosa's initiated interactions during Spanish Language Arts, it is impossible to make general statements about her language of initiation.

Thus Teacher A began to use primarily English in interactions with the two target subjects by Time II. This shift in Teacher A's and Maria's and Rosa's language of initiation probably reflects both the general anglisization of the bilingual classroom and the teacher's recognition of these two children's increased ability to comprehend and communicate in their second language.

Teacher B was very consistent in her language use with the two target children (see Table 6). She initiated in English for English Language Arts and in Spanish for all other activities. The target children were not so consistent. They had become used to the previous general use of English in the classroom, and unsuccessfully tried to interact with the teacher in English. She however, pressured them to use Spanish by not answering their English questions (outside of English Language Arts) or by continuing to speak Spanish.

Sometimes, the teacher was unsuccessful in getting the child to use Spanish as in the following example:

Teacher: Dónde está número dos?

Rosa: This is one, I did number five already.

Teacher: Ester, ésa es mala, mira cambia ésta y ésta.

Rosa: Which one is wrong?

TABLE 6

Percentage of interactions in each language initiated by Teacher B and Target Children

Maria	MATH			ENGLISH			SPANISH			CULTURE			TOTAL		
	Eng	Sp	Cs*	Eng	Sp	Cs	Eng	Sp	Cs	Eng	Sp	Cs	Eng	Sp	Cs
Teacher Initiates	0	100	0	100	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	50	50	0
Maria Initiates	20	40	40	100	0	0	67	33	0	0	0	0	62	23	05
Rosa															
Teacher Initiates				100	0	0	17	23	50						
Rosa Initiates				100	0	0	0	0	0						

*Cs = Code-switching interactions.

Teacher: Las dos están malos.

Rosa: Which one?

Teacher: Las dos. Allí están.

And sometimes she was successful.

Maria: I've done it already.

Teacher: Este no estaba bien. Este está bien (etc.)

Maria: Esto no lo hice.

Occasionally teacher B used English when a child initiated in English. However, she gave a minimal reply in English and then switched into Spanish.

e.g.[1] Teacher: Que es tiza?

Rosa: Chalk.

Teacher: Chalk, right.
Lo que uno usa para escribir en la pizarra.

e.g.[2] Maria: Can I sharpen my pencil?

Teacher: No, that's sharp enough.
Y ahora vamos a leer la pagina 64
Comprende?

Thus teacher B attempted to use mainly Spanish with the two target subjects.

Other Students. By taping period II it became clear that teacher A used Spanish with specific students in the classroom, regardless of the activity going on. Those children she used Spanish with did not speak English very well. Clearly the two target children, Rosa and Maria, were not among this population. This suggests that teacher A was becoming more flexible in her language use in order to meet the communication needs of individual children. This tendency is also seen by teacher B, who during English Language Arts, used Spanish exclusively with a few children.

Thus, it is possible that the language chosen by the teacher was determined in part by her concept of the child's language ability. For teacher A, this involved the use of English with those who understood it, and the use of Spanish for those who did not. For teacher B, the rule was different: Use Spanish with all children during Spanish, culture and math; use English during English Language Arts except use Spanish for those who can't understand English.

TABLE 7

Percentage of interactions in each language for Teacher-child interactions (Teacher A)

Maria's Class	MATH			INDIVIDUAL			ENGLISH			SPANISH			CULTURE			TOTAL TIME		
	Sp	Eng	Cs*	Sp	Eng	Cs	Sp	Eng	Cs	Sp	Eng	Cs	Sp	Eng	Cs	Sp	Eng	Cs
TIME I	43	35	22	-	-	100	-	92	08	100	-	-	37	32	32	37	40	24
TIME II	11	55	33	none on taping day			-	64	36	20	80	-	-	67	33	03	59	43
Rosa's Class																		
TIME I	33	33	33	-	-	100	-	100	-	87	13	-	43	29	29	56	33	11
TIME II	13	63	25	-	33	67	-	-	100	18	18	64	-	100	-	12	45	42

*Cs = Code-switching interactions.

Purpose of the Message. While some language use patterns may be explained by "activity" and "person", a great many instances, especially those where code switching occurred, still remain unaccounted for. Many of these can be explained by focusing on the content or function of the utterance.

For Time I, the teacher used English to comment on what was going on in the classroom, for giving directives, and commenting on the appropriateness or correctness of the student's work. Spanish was used in all lessons (except English Language Arts) by the teacher for instructional discourse: the providing of information, facts, opinions or ideas. While English was sometimes used for this purpose these cases occurred only when the informing in English was proceded by a directive in English. Abundant examples of this differential language use were found in the math lessons.

e.g. 1. O.K. let's go to the next one. Cuanto en total?
Siete escribe siete en el cuadrito..

e.g. 2. Sit down! Turn your paper on the other side.

In Time II, the explanation presented above becomes a little bit more complex. As can be seen from Table 7, the proportion of teacher-child interactions where code switching occurred increased considerably from Time I (Maria: 24% to 43%; Rosa: 11% to 42%). This jump is probably due to the teacher's more flexible use of the two languages in the classroom: she was more sensitive to the linguistic needs of individual children. Evidence for this is seen in the increase of code switching during the English lesson. Many of these are explained by the teacher's translating words, or directions from English into Spanish (or the other way around).

e.g. And who remembers what this is? Trigo-wheat.
When you're ready put up your hand and I'll check your papers.
Levante la mano.

Usually translation occurred in interactions with individual children rather than with the group. During Time II English was still used for directives and procedural instructions or questions (e.g. can you see?) and Spanish for informing, especially in the math lesson. But again, the teacher seemed to modify this pattern by using the language that most suited the child's linguistic skills.

Teacher B used some of these same patterns; however, the effects were not as clear in that she didn't use very much English. However, when she did use English outside of the English lesson, it was to give directives or to make procedural statements.

Teacher B also used a lot of Spanish in the English lesson to translate instructions and concepts she had just given in English into Spanish.

e.g. The eyes of the clown, please.
Solamente los ojos.

These remarks were directed to individual children rather than to the class as a whole.

Thus, to some degree, the two teachers used Spanish and English to express similar functions, although not to the same extent. Teacher B seemed to be more consistent in her use of the two languages to express different functions than Teacher A. Teacher B's main rule for language use seemed to be: use Spanish as much as possible (except in the instances noted above). For teacher A, a combination of the rules based on activity, person and content discussed earlier seem to provide an adequate description of her language using strategies.

2. Qualitative analysis of peer-peer talk in the English classroom.

In the regular classroom, the rule for differential language use between the target subjects and their peers seemed to be: use Spanish when the addressee's knowledge of English is extremely limited; otherwise use English. For all three taping sessions, Maria interacted in Spanish exclusively with one child: Miriam. In fact, the teacher used Maria during the first taping session as Miriam's interpreter. Her decrease in Spanish use in the regular classroom is a function of a decrease in her interactions with Miriam. (See Table 4).

During taping period I, Rosa interacted with a Spanish dominant child, Patty, solely in Spanish. She also served as her interpreter for the teacher. For the second period, Rosa was seated next to a new Spanish-speaking child, Omar, with whom she only spoke Spanish. During this period, she also spoke exclusively in Spanish to Elena. Then in taping period III, a strange phenomenon occurred: Rosa was seated next to another child, Juan (who was also in the bilingual class). She began all her interactions with him in Spanish, but he replied in English. Eventually, by the end of the lesson, she only interacted with him in English. Clearly, Rosa was not following the standard rule: only use Spanish if the addressee cannot function in English. Why did she persist to speak to Juan in Spanish? There are several possibilities:

(a) Throughout the year, Rosa had sat next to Spanish dominant children in the English classroom with whom she had interacted exclusively in Spanish. The situation with Juan marked the first time in our tapes that this pattern did not hold true. She may have spoken Spanish to Juan because she was used to being seated next to Spanish dominant youngsters with limited command of English. Unfortunately, we do not have sufficient information to confirm this hypothesis (e.g. how long had she been sitting next to him, and why had the teacher placed her there?)

(b) There may have been some effect from the new bilingual teacher who had affected the language patterns of that classroom. The new teacher used Spanish as often as possible. Rosa may have

learned that one should speak Spanish with the participants of the bilingual classroom regardless of the context and thus she spoke Spanish to Juan, who shunned these advances.

(c) It may also be that the new bilingual teacher caused some confusion in Rosa's sociolinguistic conception of the world: language-using rules changed radically since the new teacher arrived. Rosa was having to learn a new set of rules for language use which still may have been in transition. There may have been mild confusion about which language to use in different situations which was reflected in her inappropriate choice of language with Juan.

While there are many other interesting results, only one more will be discussed. It was noted in our analysis of the regular classroom data that the bilingually schooled children were not marked for attending a special program. No negative remarks were made by either of the teachers or the other children in the classroom. Furthermore, there seemed to be a very lenient atmosphere in terms of language use: the children were never pressured to use English, in fact, the opposite sometimes occurred when the teachers used both students as translators for Spanish-speaking peers.

3. Qualititative analysis of peer-peer talk in the bilingual classroom.

The rules for peer-peer language use in the bilingual classroom were different from those in the regular classroom. These rules are not yet fully apparent to us: they appear to change among taping periods and differ for the two target children.

For time period I, English was used by both Rosa and Maria while engaging in routinized and structured activities: for example, reading a book, repeating well used phrases. Spanish was used for negotiating an activity: for example, choosing a book, or setting up the rules of the game. This use of language by the students among themselves was in direct contrast to teacher language use in the bilingual classroom: the teacher used English to set up and negotiate situations, the students used Spanish; the teacher used Spanish for substantive parts of an activity, the students used English.

This reverse effect may be due to several factors. First, it may reflect the students' level of English language competence. It was easier to use English for routinized activities, in that many of the utterances were set by the activity and had been used and rehearsed many times before. On the other hand, the use of Spanish was reserved for expression of more complex and more varied concepts. The second possibility was that the students used a pattern different from the teacher's to set themselves apart from her. This last explanation is given some credence by the data from period II, where the above patterns of English for routines and Spanish for negotiation still held for Rosa's data. Maria and her peers on the other hand seemed to choose the opposite language from that used by the

teacher in the lesson. Referring to Table 8, we see this most clearly in the English and culture lessons, and somewhat in the Spanish lessons. This pattern is not found for Rosa's data.

For taping period III, the data don't seem to fit any of the above patterns. As mentioned earlier, language use patterns during period III were in the process of changing. The Spanish-negotiation, English-routine analysis of these data, showed no systematic pattern. To use the opposite language of the teacher accounted for part of Maria's language use in math, English and Spanish, and for Rosa's in Spanish: however, many utterances still remain unexplained. We looked to see if the children used English or Spanish with certain children, but this did not yield positive results; we looked at the language that preceded the interaction and this too showed no regular patterns. In order to properly do this analysis, more detailed information on the children with whom the subjects were interacting would be required. Unfortunately these data were not collected.

These analyses indicated a number of interesting facts about peer-peer language use by bilingually schooled children.

1. There were a different set of rules for language use in the bilingual and regular classrooms.

2. In the bilingual classroom, these rules changed over the course of the year.

3. It is possible that teacher's language dominance, which affected teacher-child interactions in the bilingual classroom, also affected child-child interactions in both classrooms.

Discussion

This study has described certain phenomena about the processes of bilingual schooling which should be of interest to both the educator and the theoretician.

There are a few findings which are of specific interest to the bilingual educator. The first is that language dominance of the teacher seemed to determine the language environment of the classroom: the English-dominant teacher gave the bilingual classroom a distinctly English atmosphere, while the Spanish-dominant teacher gave the classroom a Spanish atmosphere. Language dominance of the teacher affected language use patterns not only in terms of total amount of language used, but also in the ways each language was used. There was also the slight suggestion that teacher's language dominance might affect the child's language outside of the bilingual classroom (namely in the regular classroom).

Data such as these can be used by the bilingual educator to verify whether or not the type of program as set out by local guidelines is

TABLE 8

Percentage of time Spanish was used for interactions for Taping Period II.

	Math	English	Spanish	Culture
Maria Period II				
Teacher/Child	55%	3%	92%	7%
Child/Child	0%	90%	21%	100%

actually being followed by the teacher. In the context of the present study, Teacher A's language use patterns are consistent with the general guidelines for a "transitional" program. This is seen by her gradual increase of English into the curriculum over the year; her speaking Spanish (during Time II) only with children who cannot function in English. Whether her behavior is intentional or not, these patterns are consistent with the philosophy of using the first language as a means (or bridge) for increasing facility in the second language, and then gradually phasing out the first language.

Similarly, these data are also of interest to those concerned with linguistic and cultural maintenance. One of the goals of many bilingual programs is to foster and promote growth in these areas. This was not achieved in this program: the children used less Spanish among themselves at the end of the year than at the beginning; the culture lesson (in Teacher A's classroom) was eventually taught in English rather than Spanish. However, these trends are fully consistent with the aims of a transitional program and offer further evidence that such a model is being followed.

These data have ramifications for teacher-training programs. Because so many bilingual teachers are English dominant (General Accounting Office, 1976) they should be trained to become more conscious of their language use patterns so that they don't use English to the exclusion of the other language.

Lastly this study is a good example of how process data can be crucial in the interpretation of product data. Specifically, in program evaluation, teacher language proficiency may be an important factor in accounting for pupil performance on certain tests. Children who have English dominant teachers (who, according to these pilot results, tend to use more English and less Spanish in the bilingual classroom) may perform better than expected on English language tests, and worse than expected on Spanish language tests. These results should not be attributed to failure of "bilingual education" to promote first language skills, but to individual teacher and classroom variation.

For the sociolinguist, many of the above results are also of interest for they shed some more light on the rules for speaking in different classrooms. The analysis indicated that not one, but a complex interaction of many social variables (e.g. activity, addressee, classroom, teacher's language) must be considered in the discussion of language use patterns.

While certain primary patterns of language use were identified which confirm findings of other studies, (c.f. Shultz, 1975; Genishi, 1976; Phillips, 1975; Legarreta, 1975) many questions remain unanswered. The largest problem which deserves greater study is the patterns of peer/peer interaction. These are of importance because their interpretation will add insight into the social meaning these languages have for the bilingually schooled child.

Results of this study also confirm other sociolinguists' (Blom and Gunperz, 1972) contention that self-reports of language use are highly unreliable. Specifically we have the case of Teacher A who reported that she used mainly Spanish in the bilingual classroom. Her perception of her language use was certainly not consistent with the data.

Lastly, we would like to consider the value of ethnographic and video data analysis as an evaluation technique. There is no doubt that this technique yields large quantities of rich data which can be analyzed in a number of different ways. For example, in terms of the data collected for this analysis, the same tapes could also be used for:

(a) teacher training (pre- and inservice)

(b) the assessment of academic skills in a naturalistic environment (e.g. reading)

(c) linguistic analysis of first and second language development.

However, for the evaluator, there are many difficulties in using videotape methods for collecting process data. What follows is a list of some problems which occurred in this study.

The first consideration is the expense in terms of both money and time. The equipment and the tapes are expensive. One must have a minimum of three staff in the classroom during taping (one for each camera, and a third taking notes on classroom events). In terms of time this study was very expensive: there were at least 18 full days of data collections, (6 days x 3 research assistants), another 21 days for coding, 10 days for transcription, and 17 days for data analysis. Thus, 66 working days were devoted to the study of two bilingually-schooled students.

Despite the amount of data collected and the amount of manhours invested in this study, we feel that our data are insufficient for making very general statements about the nature of language use patterns in these classrooms. At several points in the paper we question the reliability of our data: that is, were the patterns seen for a particular taping period peculiar to that taping day only? Also, in other parts, results are not clearly interpreted because we lack important data regarding specific classroom variables (e.g. seating patterns, attendance, language abilities of non-target subjects); systematic on-site observations of the classrooms throughout the course of the year could have provided the necessary supplementary information. These problems indicate that video techniques are not sufficient to collect and analyze process data and that additional data collection procedures (and time) are required. Although the above procedures may be normal for the researcher, for the evaluator they are impractical. His priorities involve collecting as much data as possible in as short a period of time as possible on the maximum number of subjects.

While it is true that a great deal of time and money was spent examining the school life of only two children, it is also true that the data collected are invaluable as they give us a lucid and detailed picture of the process of education for these students. Some compromise could be reached, so that the evaluator has access to these techniques. A system might be developed which cuts down on the time investment without greatly affecting the quality of the collected data. This system might include less use of video tape with use of audio tape and some on-site observations. Of course, the development of such a system could only result from a research project which had this development as its main aim.

Footnote

1. The senior author was on a one year's leave of absence at the Center for Applied Linguistics, Arlington, Virginia, during the course of this project. This study was part of the "Evaluation of Illinois Downstate Bilingual Programs 1975-76". A contract granted to the Center for Applied Linguistics by the Illinois Bilingual Education Service Center.

The authors are grateful to Andrew Cohen and Flora Brown for their help in every stage of the project.

References

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS
1975 Bilingual Program Evaluation Report, ESEA, Title VII 1974-75.

BARIK, H C., and SWAIN, M.
1975 Three-year evaluation of a large scale early grade French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study. Language Learning, 25.1-30.

BEACON, 1973. See METRONAMICS, 1973.

BLOM, J.P., and GUMPERZ, J.
1972 "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structures: code switching in Norway" in John Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.) Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

BRUCK, M., LAMBERT, W.E., and TUCKER, G.R.
1974 Bilingual schooling through the elementary grades: The St. Lambert project at Grade seven. Language Learning, 24:183-204.

CHULA VISTA.
1973 Bilingual Program Evaluation Report, ESEA, Title VII 1972-73. Chula Vista, California.

COHEN, A.D.
1975 A Sociolinguistic Approach to Bilingual Education:Experiments in the American Southwest. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

CORPUS CHRISTI.
1975 Bilingual Program Evaluation Report, ESEA, Title VII. 1974-75 Corpus Christi, Texas.

COX, L.
1975 Caribou Bilingual Program Evaluation Report, ESEA, Title VII 1974-75. Caribou, Maine.

Dillon, P.
1971 Annual Title VII Evaluation for San Francisco.

ERIKSON, F., and SHULTZ, J.
1976 "When is a context?: Some Issues and Methods in the Analysis of Social Competence" Unpublished manuscript, Harvard University.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
1976 Bilingual Education and unmet need. Comptroller General's Report to Congress.

GENISHI, C.
1976 Rules for code-switching in young Spanish-English speakers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Berkley.

GOODENOUGH, W.
1964 "Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics". In Language in Culture and Society. ed. D. Hymes. New York: Harper and Row.

GOODMAN, F. M., and STERN, C.
1971 Bilingual Program Evaluation Report, ESEA, Title VII 1970-71. Compton City Schools, Compton, California.

GUMPERZ, J.
1976 Language, Communication and Public Negotiation. In Peggy Reeves Sunday (Ed). Anthropology and the Public Interest. New York Academic Press.

HYMES, D.
1976 Ethnographic Monitoring. Paper prepared for the symposium in "Language Development in a Bilingual Setting". Pomona, California.

LEGARRETA, D.
1975 An Analysis of Teacher Talk and Pupil Talk in Bilingual classrooms. Mimeo, University of California, Berkley.

MEHAN, H., CAZDEN, C., FISHER, S., and MAROULES, N.,
1976 The Social Organization of Classroom Lessons. A tecnical report submitted to Ford Foundation.

McDERMOTT, R.P.
1976 Kids Make Sense: an ethnographic account of the interactional management of success and failure in one first-grade classroom. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford University.

METRONAMICS.
1973 Bilingual Program Evaluation Report. ESEA, Title VII 1972-73. Beacon Independent School District, Beacon, New York.

PHILLIPS, S.
1975 Code Switching in Bilingual Classrooms. Unpublished Masters Thesis, California State College.

SHULTZ, J.
1975 Language Use in Bilingual Classrooms. Unpublished Manuscript. Harvard Graduate School of Education.

SHULTZ, J.
1976 "It's not whether you win or lose, it s how you play the game": A microethnographic analysis of game playing in a kindergarten/ first grade classroom. Working paper, Newton Classroom Interaction Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

END

DEPT. OF HEW

NAT'L INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

NOV. 3. 1977